A. Supplement to Introduction *(1.)*: Modes of Twitter communication

Supplementary Table 1. Modes of Twitter communication: Broadcast vs. conversation

Mode of Twitter communication	Broadcasting	Conversation
Context provided by…	Follow Relationships	Hashtags (#)
Interaction with other users through…	Retweets	@messages

B. Supplement to Results *(3.1.):* User-categories of @message senders and recipients

Supplementary Table 2. User-categories of @message senders and recipients. Number of users sending (1) and receiving (3) @messages, volume of sent (2) and received (4) @messages and percentage of each user category in the respective total (in parenthesis)

User category	(1) Number of senders (Share)	(2) Volume of sent @messages (Share)	(3) Number of recipients (Share)	(4) Number of received @messages (Share; Average; Median)
Total	565	888	368	888
Media outlets	3 (0.5 %)	3 (0.3 %)	36 (9,3 %)	176 *(19,8 %; 4.8 ; 1)*
Journalists	6 (1 %)	11 (1.2 %)	46 (11,9 %)	164 *(18,5 %; 3.5; 1)*
Bloggers	**42 (7.4 %)**	**93 (10.4 %)**	**51 (13, 2 %)**	**60 *(6,8 %; 1.17; 1)***
Citizens	**497 (88 %)**	**751 (85 %)**	**185 (47, 9 %)**	**213 *(24 %; 1.15 ;1)***
Politicians	4 (0.7 %)	5 (0.7 %)	39 (10.1 %)	178 *(20 %; 4.5 ;1)*
Parties	4 (0.7 %)	12 (1.4 %)	17 (4,4 %)	82 *(9,3 %; 4.8 ;1)*
NGOs & Others	9 (1.6 %)	12 (1.4 %)	12 (3,1 %)	15 (1, 1.25 ;7 %)

Supplementary Table 2 not only disaggregates all 888 @messages with the hashtags "#JeremyCorbyn" or "#Corbyn", which were posted during the TV debate according to the coded group-identity of their authors and recipients, but also indicates how many accounts of each group sent or received these messages

This overview shows that elite actors hardly engage in conversational @message exchange: The contribution of politicians, journalists, media venues and parties to the conversation is limited to a maximum of 1.4% and a minimum of 0.3% of the total number of @messages. In contrast to this, 497 accounts (88% of all @message senders) of average citizens account for the majority of Twitter conversations (751 Tweets, 85%), while 42 bloggers (7.4% of all @message senders) contribute a non-negligible 10.4% (93 Tweets) of all @messages. However, the strong difference between the number of @message senders (565) and @message recipients (368) implies that this relatively large number of @message senders focuses its conversational efforts on a comparatively small set of other users. On the one hand, this indeed seems to favor particular elite users, as the average number of received @messages per recipient is considerably larger for elite users than for citizens and bloggers. On the other hand, the

identical median values of all user groups indicate that only a small set of elite users profits from the focused conversational attention, while the majority of elite users does not receive more @messages than non-elite addressees. Furthermore, the largest share of @messages (24% of all @messages) is exchanged between citizens who also constitute the largest group of @message recipients (47.9% of all recipients), followed only by bloggers (13.2% of all recipients).

C. Supplement to Results *(3.1.)*: Test of significance for user groups' likelihood to receive @messages (indegree-centrality)

Supplementary Table 3. Indegree-Centrality: Kruskal-Wallis test of inter-group differences

Kruskal-Wallis rank sum test		
Null Hypothesis	**Kruskal-Wallis X^2**	**p-value**
Location parameter of indegree-distributions are identical in each group of Twitter users	49.48	> 0.01

Supplementary Table 4. Indegree-Centrality: Pairwise Wilcoxon-Test of inter-group differences

Category of Twitter account	Political Blogger	Others / Citizen	Individual professional journalist	Official media outlet account	Official NGO account	Official party (-affiliated) account
Citizen	<***	-	-	-	-	-
Journalist	>**	>***	-	-	-	-
Media	>**	>***	ns	-	-	-
NGO	ns	>***	>***	>**	-	-
Party	ns	>***	ns	ns	ns	-
Politician	ns	>***	ns	<**	>***	ns

Notes: ">" indicates a higher indegree of the group-members in the respective row, "<" indicates a higher indegree of the group-members in the respective column.
Significance: ns = not significant differences, **p<0.05, ***p<0.01

D. Supplement to Results *(3.2.3.)*: Links between meta-talk and policy debates – Detailed Analysis, *cf. figure 4*

More particularly figure 4 shows, that the debate concerning economic policies is related to every one of the 12 forms of meta-talk. Considered together with its similarly central localization in the one policy discourse network (cf. Figure 3), this position makes economic policies the single most important policy issue for integrating the debate. However, besides their evident preference for the evaluation of the performance of politicians (which is observable for all policy nodes), users discussing economy-related policies clearly favor fact-checking, partisan statements and criticism of second-screen venues over other forms of meta-talk. In respect to this, the node is structurally equivalent to the @message debate concerning historical policy questions and very similar to the deliberation of security policy. Those authors also show a strong inclination towards the latter types of meta-talk. Despite being connected to all except for two types of meta-talk, @messages concerning Brexit have an even narrower emphasis: 43% of this node's linkages connect to the evaluation of politicians' performance, as 68% of all users making a Brexit-related statement (17/29) also scrutinize politicians and only at maximum 6 refer to other meta-talk perspectives. Political strategy occupies a more peripheral position, as none of the authors of security-related @messages mentions any topic related to media setting except the criticism of the non-debate format (4 users). The similar or peripheral position of domestic sociopolitical issues indicates that their overall lower popularity – in comparison with the 5 most popular topics (cf. Table 2, Figure 2) – as well as the weakness of their linkages to the latter (cf. Figure 3) impacts their consideration in meta-talk-related conversation and therefore their embeddedness in the overarching discourse.

E. Supplement to Results *(3.3)*: **Results of Poisson Regression Models,** *cf. figure 5*

DV: @messages received by **bloggers**				
Variables (categ. of content)	Estimate	Std. Error	z value	Pr(>|z|)
<u>Policy Issues</u>				
EU-Brexit	0,88367792	0,28016862	3,15409313	0,00160998
Society	0,29334407	0,17250918	1,70045486	0,0890454
Economy	0,13615528	0,21507306	0,63306524	0,52669104
Labor Market	-1,3898142	1,91429982	-0,726017	0,46782835
Immigration	1,32281087	0,74116006	1,78478433	0,07429631
Health & Education	-0,3065444	0,76846385	-0,3989054	0,68996292
Historical Political Events	0,56726226	0,20040581	2,83056798	0,00464654
Security	0,22520181	0,17394221	1,29469324	0,19542607
Environmental Policy	1,68466763	0,73591079	2,28922807	0,0220661
Political Strategy	1,3659814	0,5774424	2,3655715	0,01800227
<u>Meta-Talk</u>				
Praise for media setting	2,32851986	0,65503048	3,55482673	0,00037823
Link/General reference to TV debate	1,10909486	0,68069529	1,62935587	0,10323771
Link/General reference to other second screen medium	0,40560097	0,60558774	0,66976417	0,50300814
Criticism of media setting - Journalists questions	0,72354088	0,60550987	1,19492829	0,23211505
Criticism of media setting - Audience selection/questions	2,43315912	0,74655344	3,25918948	0,00111731
Criticism of 'second screen' media outlets - Bias	1,75269478	0,53409314	3,28162755	0,0010321
Criticism of media setting - Format	0,00145554	1,40999853	0,0010323	0,99917635
Evaluation of politicians' style and tone	0,88004342	0,41111956	2,14060216	0,03230613
Evaluation of politicians' competency	1,14328684	0,27824968	4,10885229	3,98E-05
Fact Checking	1,86003026	0,33972525	5,47510155	4,37E-08
General anti-establishment statements	1,7069229	0,61140488	2,79180452	0,0052415
Partisan statements	1,26206326	0,38985418	3,23727005	0,00120679
Satire and personal anecdotes	1,65077533	0,38544357	4,28279375	1,85E-05

DV: @messages received by citizens				
Variables (categ. of content)	Estimate	Std. Error	z value	Pr(>|z|)
Policy Issues				
EU-Brexit	-0,7023683	0,37977946	-1,8494110	0,06439848
Society	0,19397509	0,23211026	0,83570233	0,40332239
Economy	0,44926419	0,14684589	3,05942645	0,00221761
Labor Market	1,473271	0,56498846	2,6076125	0,00911761
Immigration	1,29027046	0,35866377	3,59743736	0,00032137
Health & Education	0,52707088	0,34264937	1,53822225	0,12399428
Historical Political Events	-0,0842143	0,13986242	-0,6021226	0,54709254
Security	0,32446529	0,11247468	2,88478508	0,00391681
Environmental Policy	-0,409500	0,81742027	-0,5009663	0,61639482
Political Strategy	0,38396449	0,16587326	2,31480644	0,02062353
Meta-Talk				
Praise for media setting	0,461314377	1,076188281	0,428655826	0,668173712
Link/General reference to TV debate	-0,50532423	0,344122482	-1,46844294	0,141983943
Link/General reference to other second screen medium	-0,22707178	0,227901641	-0,99635872	0,31907588
Criticism of media setting - Journalists questions	0,191825694	0,310174489	0,61844446	0,536282398
Criticism of media setting - Audience selection/questions	0,1771167	0,526799191	0,336212931	0,736710302
Criticism of 'second screen' media outlets - Bias	0,307323758	0,311149046	0,98770593	0,32329669
Criticism of media setting - Format	-0,11734111	0,35225272	-0,33311628	0,739046507
Evaluation of politicians' style and tone	0,44926963	0,182078506	2,46745014	0,013607917
Evaluation of politicians' competency	-0,19427240	0,140925756	-1,37854432	0,168035293
Fact Checking	0,0612206	0,178723851	0,342542978	0,731942306
General anti-establishment statements	-0,07327745	0,389128646	-0,18831164	0,850632358
Partisan statements	0,20416632	0,186635553	1,093930483	0,273985468
Satire and personal anecdotes	0,214836082	0,212153463	1,012644712	0,311229895

DV: @messages received by **journalists**				
Variables (categ. of content)	Estimate	Std. Error	z value	Pr(>|z|)
Policy Issues				
EU-Brexit	-0,4705835	0,30875073	-1,5241535	0,12747036
Society	-0,1886360	0,18937569	-0,9960943	0,31920432
Economy	-0,2012607	0,1881529	-1,0696657	0,2847698
Labor Market	0,12563972	0,40925307	0,30699763	0,75884517
Immigration	0,49346392	0,47265857	1,04401772	0,29647719
Health & Education	-1,1108550	0,90611852	-1,2259489	0,22021789
Historical Political Events	-0,0917537	0,17060625	-0,5378101	0,59070813
Security	0,05160207	0,12270691	0,4205311	0,67409752
Environmental Policy	0,503845695	0,327521725	1,538358091	0,123961083
Political Strategy	-0,40955418	0,272713628	-1,50177381	0,133155534
Meta-Talk				
Praise for media setting	0,004722118	0,297524284	0,01587137	0,987337011
Link/General reference to TV debate	0,312128307	0,282339947	1,105505294	0,268940702
Link/General reference to other second screen medium	-0,40730071	0,498830159	-0,81651180	0,414207475
Criticism of media setting - Journalists questions	-0,23833519	0,33423665	-0,71307318	0,475800471
Criticism of media setting - Audience selection/questions	0,630096705	0,187012396	3,369277757	0,000753654
Criticism of 'second screen' media outlets - Bias	0,179834628	0,243137506	0,739641657	0,459517458
Criticism of media setting - Format	0,460800758	0,435713204	1,057578136	0,290247815
Evaluation of politicians' style and tone	-0,11439699	0,239875396	-0,47690177	0,633432102
Evaluation of politicians' competency	0,244281949	0,264941252	0,92202308	0,356516537
Fact Checking	0,350253684	1,078781088	0,324675403	0,745426752
General anti-establishment statements	0,095227722	0,161033246	0,591354422	0,554282972
Partisan statements	-0,07113065	0,148412186	-0,47927770	0,631741082
Satire and personal anecdotes	0,131068723	0,161172633	0,813219464	0,416092242

DV: @messages received by **media venues**			
Variables (categ. of content)	Estimate	Std. Error	z value	Pr(>|z|)

Variables (categ. of content)	Estimate	Std. Error	z value	Pr(>|z|)
Policy Issues				
EU-Brexit	-0,09901872	0,196410046	-0,50414289	0,614160968
Society	-0,01764336	0,147489205	-0,11962478	0,904780383
Economy	0,44987564	0,187015052	2,40555850	0,016147766
Labor Market	0,591317449	0,270998102	2,181998488	0,029109644
Immigration	4,90436871	2,056573162	2,38472854	0,017091728
Health & Education	-0,87377904	0,731349782	-1,19474847	0,232185315
Historical Political Events	-0,18008179	0,142289179	-1,26560431	0,20565478
Security	-0,11132702	0,105515899	-1,05507346	0,291391726
Environmental Policy	-0,58739942	0,962411157	-0,61034145	0,54163564
Political Strategy	-0,22374818	0,149907271	-1,49257725	0,13554788
Meta-Talk				
Praise for media setting	0,161477609	0,785501796	0,205572552	0,83712482
Link/General reference to TV debate	-0,07479366	0,245717992	-0,30438824	0,760832126
Link/General reference to other second screen medium	-0,37296334	0,191249163	-1,95014366	0,051158998
Criticism of media setting - Journalists questions	-0,46582967	0,27395525	-1,70038602	0,089058339
Criticism of media setting - Audience selection/questions	-0,08199911	0,412663898	-0,19870677	0,842492128
Criticism of 'second screen' media outlets - Bias	0,95772992	0,298890824	3,204280102	0,001354007
Criticism of media setting - Format	0,574619878	0,266414019	2,156868024	0,031015949
Evaluation of politicians' style and tone	-0,13389888	0,18633259	-0,71860154	0,472386461
Evaluation of politicians' competency	-0,25253761	0,143370994	-1,76142753	0,078166067
Fact Checking	0,75311464	0,234200528	3,215682933	0,001301345
General anti-establishment statements	0,756055848	0,355249721	2,1282377	0,033317381
Partisan statements	0,791324065	0,218731502	3,617787373	0,000297132
Satire and personal anecdotes	1,244814618	0,341513161	3,644997501	0,000267394

DV: @messages received by politicians				
Variables (categ. of content)	Estimate	Std. Error	z value	Pr(>|z|)
Policy Issues				
EU-Brexit	0,361183014	0,215331961	1,677331185	0,093477738
Society	0,12521821	0,266638314	0,46961822	0,638627805
Economy	0,221382407	0,181953888	1,216695114	0,223720239
Labor Market	-0,9065022	0,660959393	-1,37149454	0,170220844
Immigration	0,70525225	0,48781072	1,4457498	0,148247391
Health & Education	0,313528398	0,579408315	0,541118224	0,588426098
Historical Political Events	-0,13672539	0,29802558	-0,45877068	0,646398852
Security	0,279772458	0,15742535	1,777175395	0,075539386
Environmental Policy	0,510136894	0,521678287	0,977876417	0,32813545
Political Strategy	0,334215971	0,195063006	1,713374457	0,086643672
Meta-Talk				
Praise for media setting	-31,7709269	6095876,032	-5,21E-06	0,999995842
Link/General reference to TV debate	-0,08202720	0,387202818	-0,21184557	0,83222751
Link/General reference to other second screen medium	0,051193334	0,30544302	0,167603549	0,866895179
Criticism of media setting - Journalists questions	0,053494335	0,506561291	0,105602888	0,915897433
Criticism of media setting - Audience selection/questions	-0,73866086	1,239019723	-0,59616554	0,551064641
Criticism of 'second screen' media outlets - Bias	0,219503336	0,471750283	0,465295612	0,641719777
Criticism of media setting - Format	0,653103192	0,302690917	2,157657057	0,030954505
Evaluation of politicians' style and tone	0,315516748	0,231394192	1,363546534	0,172710329
Evaluation of politicians' competency	0,221149616	0,220168928	1,004454253	0,315159711
Fact Checking	0,384093764	0,262252751	1,464593839	0,143031764
General anti-establishment statements	1,137355113	0,40454462	2,811445409	0,004931946
Partisan statements	0,490939595	0,26299268	1,866742432	0,061937565
Satire and personal anecdotes	-0,39238073	0,458565734	-0,85566953	0,392180594

DV: @messages received by parties			
Variables (categ. of content)	Estimate	Std. Error	z value	Pr(>|z|)
Policy Issues				
EU-Brexit	1,773421544	1,027083774	1,726657152	0,084229255
Society	-0,30732393	0,348211168	-0,88257920	0,377463669
Economy	0,92405453	0,35383037	2,61157494	0,009012623
Labor Market	0,237605211	0,616628804	0,385329407	0,699993377
Immigration	-35,0275637	2889025,622	-1,21E-05	0,999990326
Health & Education	-30,133051	3832278,284	-7,86E-06	0,999993726
Historical Political Events	-0,06263988	0,224774307	-0,27867904	0,780491149
Security	-0,35323334	0,199540106	-1,77023733	0,076687612
Environmental Policy	-31,2046606	8972902,271	-3,48E-06	0,999997225
Political Strategy	-0,26108729	0,250407463	-1,04264980	0,297110513
Meta-Talk				
Praise for media setting	0,212504932	0,637064838	0,333568766	0,738704991
Link/General reference to TV debate	-1,18610097	0,735820003	-1,61194445	0,106974026
Link/General reference to other second screen medium	-1,36547964	0,390241068	-3,49906701	0,000466889
Criticism of media setting - Journalists questions	-1,91531351	0,856264476	-2,23682468	0,025297801
Criticism of media setting - Audience selection/questions	0,028749284	0,441209906	0,065160106	0,948046525
Criticism of 'second screen' media outlets - Bias	-0,46409030	0,558777679	-0,83054552	0,406230419
Criticism of media setting - Format	-0,85684274	0,415816748	-2,06062586	0,039338748
Evaluation of politicians' style and tone	-0,39310446	0,598460543	-0,65685945	0,511271289
Evaluation of politicians' competency	0,329596063	0,253019281	1,302651961	0,19269361
Fact Checking	-0,45548878	0,380026963	-1,19856966	0,230695321
General anti-establishment statements	0,09162878	0,641692259	0,142792403	0,886454137
Partisan statements	0,093606766	0,31926984	0,29319013	0,769376828
Satire and personal anecdotes	0,228017548	0,302608268	0,753507328	0,45114511